PROCEEDINGS 2 1 (In open court.) 2 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: United States versus Hausa, 3 Docket Number 12-CR-134. 4 Counsel, please state your appearances starting with 5 the government. 6 MR. JACOBS: Good morning, Your Honor. Matthew 7 Jacobs, Shreve Ariail, Joseph Kaster for the United States. 8 Here with us is FBI Special Agent Greg Paciorek. 9 THE COURT: Is anyone here from Probation? 10 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, I'm here. 11 THE COURT: All right, good morning, all. 12 David Stern, Susan Kellman and Joshua MR. STERN: 1.3 Dratel for Mr. Harun. Good morning. 14 THE COURT: Good morning. I thought one of you were 15 going to be at the facility. 16 MR. STERN: We have one of my associates is at the 17 facility. Rachel Perillo is in the facility -- right here on 18 the camera as we speak, actually. So she's there and she has 19 Mayerlin Ulerio's phone number. If she wanted to contact us for any reason, she would call us and we can then communicate 20 2.1 with them. 22 THE COURT: All right, let me just state for the 23 record what's going on here. 24 This is the defendant's sentencing, and he's not

here, as was the case throughout his trial and some of the

25

3

later status conferences prior to the trial.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

At the defenses' suggestion, I had entered an order setting forth procedures to try to get the defendant to come here but to not do that at the cost of a possible violent episode.

We heard from the marshals this morning that the defendant had refused to be produced, and his words to the marshals were "This is not my court, that is not my judge."

So it seems to me he has again shown that he is knowingly and willfully not attending these proceedings.

Does defense counsel have any different view of it?

MR. STERN: No, we completely agree. It was our wish that he not be harmed and no one else be harmed, so we explicitly asked that he not be brought here.

I wanted to do one thing, Judge, unless you want, of course, I want to make sure Ms. Perillo can hear us. I'm just going ask her if she can waive or something.

Rachel, waive or something if you can hear us.

MS. PERILLO: Oh, I'm sorry. I can hear you.

THE COURT: All right, we got a waive and a smile.

MR. STERN: We're lucky.

MS. KELLMAN: It's early in the proceedings.

THE COURT: Yes. And we do have an interpreter for the defendant. He's been previously sworn. He is here in the courtroom and can be reached should the defendant indicate to

defense counsel who is there in front of his cell that he wishes to say something or speak to the interpreter.

Is also assume, while I don't see the defendant, if he wanted to come to the end of the cell, he could see his video.

Is that right, Melonie?

1.3

2.4

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yes.

THE COURT: So he has video access if he wanted to use that. It appears at the moment he does not.

Okay, just for the sake of good order. My finding is that he is knowingly and again voluntarily absenting himself from these proceedings.

MR. JACOBS: And just for the sake of the record,

Judge, I'll note that in accordance with paragraph 6 of your

February 1st order, my understanding is defense counsels'

provided a copy of this order in-house to the defendant.

THE COURT: All right. I've reviewed all of the sentencing memoranda, other documents on the extensive docket here. The first thing I want to do in terms of what we're going to do today is reject the defendant's request to call Officer Quamina as a live witness. He has submitted an affidavit that the defendant's obtained from him, defense counsel obtained from him. The government is not disputing the contents of that affidavit.

There is an issue of securing testimony from a

5 1 government employee. That was part of the discussion on this 2 affidavit. And in my view calling him as a witness to testify 3 would effectively give the defendant a second bite at that 4 apple when the parameters of his testimony have already been 5 agreed upon, and I accept that testimony. 6 In addition, I believe the parties have seen 7 probation's sentencing recommendation; is that right? 8 MR. JACOBS: The government has not. 9 MS. KELLMAN: Not yet, Judge. 10 THE COURT: What we're going to do then is I'm going 11 to ask my deputy to print out a copy for each side and take a 12 look at that, and when you're done, please return it to my 1.3 deputy and we will go forward from there. 14 For the record, probation's recommendation is life 15 imprisonment on Counts One and Two. The statutory maximum of 16 15 years on Counts Three and Four to run concurrently. And 17 then Count Six, of course, is ten years consecutive to the --18 minimum ten years consecutive to the other counts. 19 MR. JACOBS: Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Yes. 21 MR. JACOBS: With the Court's permission, I'd also 22 like to advise the Court of the presence of certain 23 individuals here that qualify as victims under the Crime

Right.

24

25

Victims' Rights Act.

THE COURT:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

6

MR. JACOBS: Present in the gallery is Jane Nelson, who is the mother of Private First Class Jerod Dennis; as well as Jillian Dennis, the sister of Jerod Dennis; and Jordan Dennis, the brother of Jerod Dennis. Also present is Command Sergeant Major Brian Severino with the U.S. Army, and Sergeant First Class David Cyr of the U.S. Army, Retired. And my understanding, Judge, is that Jordan Dennis, Command Sergeant Major Severino, and Sergeant First Class Cyr would like to make statements orally at this proceeding today. THE COURT: All right, that's fine. We will hear from them when I've heard from the parties. MR. STERN: Judge, we're returning the recommendation. THE COURT: All right, thank you. All right, both sides have had an opportunity to review that recommendation. With regard to the description of the offense and the offender characteristics in the presentence investigation report, I think the defense has raised two issues as to that. The first is the characterization of the ridgeline incident as a terrorist attack, that's at paragraphs 28 and 30 of the PSR. I understand that defense points that they believe that should be changed to a military engagement or something to designate its military nature.

I'm going to deny that request. I certainly

1.3

PROCEEDINGS

understand the defenses' argument. I have to deal with that argument. But I think it's accurate as written in the PSR he has been convicted of material support of terrorist organization, and I don't think the PSR is not inaccurate in that way.

The only other point I received from the defense on the description of the offense and the offender characteristics is that the defendant has claimed to his counsel that he's a citizen of Niger and not Nigeria. The government has proffered that they've spoken to Nigeria, Nigeria says, no, he is not. So unless the defense has something to back that up, I'm going to leave that unchanged in the PSR as well.

MS. KELLMAN: I don't think there is anything to back it up other than that's what our client's always said, Your Honor. But I would note that in the recommendation it says that he was born in Saudi Arabia, which I don't think anybody thinks is correct.

THE COURT: What I'm going to do is I am going take those portions of Sections A and C from the PSR that describe the offense and the offender characteristics, I'm going to adopt those as my findings of fact for purposes of the sentence.

Okay, let's next turn to the guidelines, which I want to emphasize to the parties are merely advisory and only

1.3

PROCEEDINGS

one factor for me to consider in determining the appropriate sentence.

Before variances, that is based on the literal language of the guidelines, that's the first thing I think I have to establish as a precedent. In doing that I'm differentiating between the interpretation of the guidelines language: Does it apply by its terms as opposed to a number of policy and other reasons that the defense has raised as to why I should not apply the guidelines, which, of course, I have the discretion to do.

So turning to Count One first. There doesn't seem to be any dispute as to the base offense level in Count One, what I'll call the raw guideline calculation that starts at 43, which even with a criminal history of Category I, and we'll talk about that, it still comes out to life imprisonment.

There is one objection to one of the enhancements that's been applied in the PSR that the defense has objected to the four-point role enhancement. I've read the arguments on that. Does the defense need to be heard any further on it?

•

MR. STERN: No, Your Honor.

MS. KELLMAN: No.

THE COURT: All right. First, I'll note that it really doesn't matter one way or the other because the guideline on Count One comes out to life, whether I add the

1 enhancement or not.

1.3

But I do think that the enhancement is appropriate here. I have to reject the defense characterization that the defendant was a, quote, mere soldier, close quote.

Putting aside the dispute over whether he should be considered a soldier, I don't think there was anything mere about this defendant. It seems to me he is at least middle management and maybe upper middle management in al-Qaeda.

It is not disputed that he had a meaningful relationship with senior terrorists within the organization. I don't think privates generally have relationships with generals or even colonels. And he served as an envoy between al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups. He also recruited people to participate in his planned bombing of the American Embassy in Nigeria. So I am quite sure the enhancement is correct as to those four points.

Now on Counts Two, there's a dispute as to whether to use guideline 2K1.4(c), which enhances the guidelines to life if there was an intent to cause death. Probation and the defendants were on the same side for this to say the enhancement — that the cross reference to murder should not apply and the government thinks that it should.

Let me ask -- again, I've read these arguments, anybody want to add anything else to them?

MR. STERN: No.

1 MR. JACOBS: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

1.3

I think the government is right. If the intent of the defendant under this guideline is to cause death as well as property damage, then the cross reference is appropriate. That's what the guideline says.

Probation has placed a gloss on it to effectively say that the plan has to reach a certain level of fruition before the cross reference is triggered. But I don't see that anywhere in the guideline. It seems to me if the defendant has done enough to get convicted for conspiracy then it has gone far enough to trigger the guideline. And I think the guideline clearly differentiates between a bombing that carries with it a risk of death, whether it is intended by the defendant or not, and a bombing that has the intent of causing death. I think that's the distinction. And I don't think it can be seriously argued that this defendant did not intend to

So my conclusion is that the base offense level, again, is 43, with the enhancements it comes out the same as Count One, which brings us to an offense level of 65 for both counts.

cause death in the bombing that he was planning.

Now I did want to ask probation something, though. The offense level for Count Two still comes out to 65, but it's got a 15-year maximum -- oh, no, that's Counts Three and

Four. Okay. That's fine. Never mind.

Next, in terms of the criminal history --

3 MR. JACOBS: Your Honor, if I may interrupt for a

4 moment.

1

2.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5 THE COURT: Yes.

MR. JACOBS: Apologies. The government made a small error in its calculation. I believe that the offense level of 65 should be reduced by three levels pursuant 2X1.1 because the offense charge was a conspiracy.

THE COURT: Oh, I missed that. Okay.

So it's 62 on Count Two.

MR. JACOBS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

On criminal history, there is a provision of the guidelines that allows a horizontal departure. The defense has requested that because this is the only conviction that the defendant has.

I recognize that, you know, it's a Category VI by reason of the enhancement, but it's based on one conviction.

I don't think it makes a great deal of difference. I don't think it makes any difference whether I horizontally depart or not as long as I remain aware that there are no prior convictions, which, of course, I do. So I'm not going to go through what would be an exercise of determining whether and how much to horizontally depart because I understand why that

1 argument applies to the guidelines.

1.3

So my finding on the guidelines, unless there's any other issues I've missed, I think is offense level of 65, Criminal History Category of VI, and that would give an advisory guideline range of life imprisonment.

The statute also requires and the guidelines pick up the mandatory ten years to be run consecutively as to Count Six .

Anybody think that, aside from the objections the defendant has raised, anyone think I computed it wrong?

MR. STERN: No.

MR. JACOBS: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. That's my finding on the quidelines.

Let me then hear from the parties as to the application of all of the statutory sentencing factors. The way I will proceed is to hear from defense counsel first.

I will advise all the parties I really did study these papers. So don't feel that you're hitting me for the first time with these arguments.

Then after that, if the defendant wants to speak, which it still does not look like he does, I will hear from him. I will then hear from the government. And then I will here from the victims or victims' representatives that have identified themselves in court today.

The Court is extremely familiar with the facts of this case and has thoroughly reviewed our papers, so I'll try not to be too repetitive, but I do think it's important to underscore a few points here today in open court.

23

24

25

1.3

First, the defendant is a lifelong jihadist. He traveled to Afghanistan just before 9/11. And his response to the attacks of 9/11 was significant. He wasn't horrified by those attacks. Just the opposite. He was inspired to join al-Qaeda. To sware allegiance to Usama Bin Laden. And to attack the brave men and women of our armed forces who were deployed there after 9/11.

The Court, of course, is familiar with the events of April 25th, 2003. I won't go into them in detail except to say that the defendant and his al-Qaeda fellow fighters ambushed U.S. soldiers. The defendant explained proudly how he opened fire with his collection of cargo and threw grenades one after the other.

Tragically two U.S. service members died that day, and I'd like to state their names on the record. 19-year-old private first class Jerod Dennis of Antlers, Oklahoma, and 24-year-old airman first class Raymond Losano of Del Rio, Texas.

They're going to speak about the affects of that, the victims and the victim's representative, so I'll leave -- I think they can say it better than I ever could.

Significantly, Judge, the killing of service men in Afghanistan didn't satisfy this defendant. He had bigger ambitious. After the ambush in 2003, he went to al-Qaeda leaders and he told them he wanted to carry out what can only

1.3

PROCEEDINGS

be described as mass murder terror attacks against Americans elsewhere in the world; specifically attacks like the embassy bombing in East Africa.

And two things are significant there, Judge, that he wasn't recruited or conscripted for this, he wanted to carry these out. And the second thing, his model. The East Africa embassy bombings. Hundreds of people dead. Thousands horrifically injured. Many horrifically injured.

You know, it's tough to imagine a plan more evil than that. It's hard to imagine an offense conduct more serious than the crimes the defendant in this case was convicted of. For that reason alone, a life sentence is warranted.

But there's another important reason why the defendant should spend the rest of his life in jail in that he remains firmly committed to jihad today. He stated in open court, quote, I'm a warrior and the war is not over, our terrorism is not over. He's threatened to kill court personnel. He is so obstructive and potentially violent he can't come to court.

I think he's beyond just being unrepentant and unremorseful and I think everything he's done before his arrest and afterwards leads to the conclusion that he will commit more crimes if he is ever released. He's beyond deterrence, and the only way to protect the public is to keep

1 him incarcerated.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

In conclusion, Judge, a life sentence here justly punishes the defendant for the crimes he committed. It sends a powerful and unambiguous message that if you conspire to kill Americans around the world and you're arrested and you're convicted after being afforded all the protections our constitution and the laws provide, you're going to spend of rest of your life in jail.

For those reasons, Judge, and the others in our papers, we respectfully submit that the Court impose a guideline sentence of life.

THE COURT: All right.

I'll hear from Mr. Dennis.

MR. JACOBS: And, Judge, if you'll allow, Mr. Dennis has requested to go last in the order of victims.

THE COURT: Whichever order you would like to hear them, I will hear them that way.

MR. JACOBS: I will start with Command Sergeant Major Severino.

THE COURT: All right.

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Just give us one moment.

COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR SEVERINO: Good morning, Your

23 Honor. I am Command Sergeant Major Brian Severino. I'm

currently assigned to Fort Bragg, North Carolina. I'm a

30-year career soldier. I've deployed multiple times to

PROCEEDINGS

Afghanistan and Iraq. I've been in multiple combat patrols and operations in my career. I just wanted to come here today to talk to the Court about how this has affected my life.

Prior to this, 25 April of 2003, I've been in combat operations and patrols. Multiple times after 25 April, I've been exposed to combat. But this day had the most significant impact on my life; not just as a soldier but personally as an individual.

On this day, how it has affected me since then is when I came home, I've disassociated myself from my family, removed myself from my family it had such an impact on me. I lost simple pleasures in dealing with things of normal people enjoying life. My family has suffered. So it's just not myself that was suffering from this event, but my family suffered. I did not participate in normal family events. In turn, eventually I lost my family and I got divorced after 19 years of marriage.

It has an emotional impact on the way I've done things since then. As a soldier, I felt this day has more impact on me, because I feel like I was not there to take care of my duties and protect the soldiers. I let down Jerod and Ray Losano. I failed them and their families by not protecting them and bringing them home like I was supposed to as a leader.

I'm sworn -- parents give leaders in the military

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS 18 their sons and daughters and they trust us to take care of them and protect them, and on this day I failed, and it has weighed on me. It has weighed on me because all the combat after that I've never lost another soldier. And I did my job as a soldier for 30 years and I've taken care all of them and protected and brought all my men home. And I just failed on one day and it has been hitting me hard. For the last 15 years it's been working on me. I'm trying to move on with my life. I'm nearing my time in the Army is almost complete, but it has worn all this time and affected my career and my family the most. And I've let too many people down, specifically the families of Jerod Dennis and Ray Losano. That's all I have to say, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, Command Sergeant. Who is next. MR. JACOBS: Sergeant First Class David Cyr, U.S. Army, Retired, Your Honor. SERGEANT FIRST CLASS CYR: Good morning, Your Honor. THE COURT: Good morning. SERGEANT FIRST CLASS CYR: Good morning to all those here present to hear my words. I'm United States Army Retired Sergeant First Class

David F. Cyr, Jr. As we sit here in realtime, we are two

1.3

PROCEEDINGS

months short of the 15-year anniversary of this deadly ambush.

My experience, my injuries, my memories, the loss of my comrades make it feel like it's happened yesterday. Not one second, minute, hour or day goes by where the tragic events of that fateful morning is not at the forefront on my thoughts and mind. There's no replacing the lives of those who crawled, walk, ran, and fought to my left and right to preserve our very lives so we can return home to our families.

The events of that day continuously haunt me with meticulous clarity. I will never forget the expression on Private First Class Jerod Dennis' face the last time I looked at him or looked upon him. It was a face of a confident and courageous warrior. Nor have I forgotten all the times we shared jokes, but then I'm quickly reminded he is no longer here but not forgotten.

In the days and years since the murders that took the lives of so many of my comrades, I've been given the opportunity to share the story of the legacies of my brothers in arms and what happened to us that morning. Despite all those opportunities, I fight through emotions to contemplate what I should speak about today in the presence of the adversary who tried with all his might to take my life, as he did those I was serving with.

Should I speak about the survivor's guilt that is my burden ever since that day, or my inability to appreciate

1.3

PROCEEDINGS

joyous occasions shared between family, friends, brothers in arms and loved ones, because in those moments is when I'm overwhelmed but not defeated by a quilt-ridden depression.

Maybe I should speak how it took six years after this ambush that my own sisters, Jenna and Nancy, to open up and admit their fear they harbor towards me thinking that I was so angry that I was going to loss my sanity and kill someone.

Should I speak of the wounds, although not visible to the untrained eye but no less existent? Despite not dying on the battlefield with my brothers in arms, I am faithful that I am here before you today, even though I live with bilateral hearing loss from the grenades that detonated in such close proximity to me that day, and the invisible wound of posttraumatic stress disorder.

Being able to come home to my family is a blessing that I will never take for granted and that he, nor anyone, can ever take away. I found the strength and courage to seek professional counseling in February 2014, which I still attend to this day. A characteristic and strength that no matter what atrocity you commit against me, I am, and forever will be, a United States Army soldier at heart, mind, body, and soul, and that you cannot defeat that.

It is my mission to live as long as it takes to be there for my family, my former comrades, my brothers in arms,

PROCEEDINGS 21 1 and myself to see your isolation from society for the rest of 2. your life. 3 You may have some moral victory in your mind about 4 what you did that day. But today you will forever endure the 5 loss of not successfully taking my life. And I stand here in 6 victory over you, and you will never take away from me my will 7 to fight, live, and the love I have for my brothers and my 8 country. 9 That is all I have, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Thank you. All right. 11 MR. JACOBS: And finally, Your Honor, Jordan Dennis, 12 the brother of Private First Class Jerod Dennis. 1.3 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Dennis. 14 MR. DENNIS: Good morning, Your Honor. 15 If it's okay with the Court, my comments are 16 directed more towards the defendant, if that's okay. 17 THE COURT: It's okay. 18 MR. DENNIS: In July of 1987, Jerod Rhoton Dennis

MR. DENNIS: In July of 1987, Jerod Rhoton Dennis became a leader. At almost four years old he became a big brother. His ability to love and care for another was immediate. Social and outspoken, Jerod would translate his new brother's cries and grunts for the adults so they can warm the milk and change the diaper. His little brother depended on him for basketball and fishing lessons and all those important things young kids need to learn. Jerod would also

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 provide leadership for his little brother.

1.3

Jerod was more than just a big brother. He would walk into any room and flood it with laughter and smiles.

Jerod can make anyone laugh and anyone smile. His gift was love and laughter. His family and friends depended on him for that.

April 25th, 2003, could have been a normal day that ended like a normal night, but sometime before then you felt the pain of the world, a pain we've all encountered; loss of something or someone, and you chose to react to that pain with anger and rage. April 25th, 2003 could have been a normal day, but someone you follow delivered a verdict and you and your rage came to deliver a sentence.

Since that day, I have not stopped looking for him everywhere I go and in every face I encounter since those first hellish moments in this new reality.

I have every right to hate you, to curse you. I have every right to be angry, to use my tongue like a dagger in an attempt to get even, and no one would blame me.

But I must share a truth that I have learned. You, your anger, your rage, your malicious intent, your weapon of my hero's destruction, your guns, your violence, your bullets, your tools of harm, all of that is just background noise to the true tragedy here. Jerod's absence. Our loss.

Your expanse and Jerod's last moments made you feel

1.3

PROCEEDINGS

like you were at Ground Zero. But you have no idea. Ground Zero was on the other side of the world in a small town in Oklahoma. Today I'm often distracted by my brother's absence, always half listening while half mourning. But I talk to him often and still have his leadership. Jerod lives on more than ever.

My sister, my mother, and father, my family and friends see him in me and I see him in them. It is in our lives you will see Jerod's legacy of love, laughter, and caring.

On April 26th, 2003, we all woke up in a cold world but Jerod is the warm sunshine that brightens it. And in that light we will not be blind to the world, we will be active and we will make a place for Jerod's memory, legacy, and love to live on.

Jerod's 19 years of impact on this world was far stronger and more powerful than your few seconds you spent trying to destroy it. Your few seconds may have caused mass destruction, but soon after, at Ground Zero, Jerod brought us together and we began to rebuild, and Jerod's story did not end with your few seconds. There have been many chapters since then and he is still the main character.

My over 15 years with my brother learning and following his lead taught me more than your few seconds did.

I will not join you in your cyclical hatred. I will not give

1 in to your systemic terrorism with hatred and anger. 2 have caused my pain, but Jerod caused my forgiveness. 3 of Jerod, I say to you that I hold no ill will towards you. 4 I do not seek to indemnify you for your actions, but 5 know that you are the only person that is angry -- I'm 6 sorry -- but know that the only person that is angry now is I wish our circumstances were different so that neither 7 of us were here. But Jerod is still with us and I feel so 8 9 sorry for you. You see, Jerod is only concerned with those he 10 loves now and I know that. 11 So I will do what I have done since July of 1987; 12 follow his lead. You and your few seconds are not my concern. 1.3 My family, friends, Jerod's memory and legacy are. Those are 14 the people and things that carry me forward. Everywhere I am 15 present, there will always be at least two, my brother and me. 16 As for you, I hope you let go of your anger and rage and find 17 peace in your life. Thank you for your time. 18 19 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Dennis. 20 I need about five or ten minutes and we will 21 reconvene then. 22 (Whereupon, a recess was taken at 10:36 a.m.) 23 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. 24 THE COURT: Be seated, please. 25 I've considered all of the applicable sentencing

PROCEEDINGS

factors under the statute, including the advisory guidelines.

The first thing I want to do is to thank the family members and friends who came today, and particularly those who spoke. I want to tell you that, you know, as I articulate the sentence here it might sound very technical and legal to you, and that's because we have to make sure that sentence is pronounced dispassionately, according to the law, but I don't want you to think for a second that I didn't hear what you said and that I don't appreciate the human element here and that I haven't been influenced by what you said, because I have. I have taken it to heart in just the way you intended it and I appreciate the real costs here.

Having said that, let me turn to the sentencing factors and the higher courts have said that the place I am to start is with the sentencing guidelines.

I will tell you, this is, again, a technical point for the lawyers mostly, that I don't think the guidelines are all that helpful in a case like this. For some but not all of the reasons that defense counsel has stated, it's just that when you add together so many numbers for so many enhancements, you lose track of what actually happened and what a depraved individual this defendant is and the terrible affect that he's had on people, you get lost in the numbers.

I don't think this is the kind of crime or the kind of defendant that lends itself very easily to mathematization

1.3

where you just put numbers on everything and look at that as a proxy for how horrible it was.

What I take from the guidelines is that Congress and the Commission considered this kind of crime under these circumstances with these results by a defendant like this to be as severe a federal crime as there is. And that's what I'm taking from the guidelines, but that's all I'm taking from the guidelines.

Having said that, you know, I don't have any doubt that the other sentencing factors that the law requires me to consider, independently without even considering the guidelines, compel a sentence of life imprisonment.

I understand that's the most severe sentence I could impose. I don't know that I've ever done it before. I certainly do not do it lightly. But I think that all of the relevant non-guideline sentencing factors as well as the guidelines strongly point to that conclusion.

Not that the factors and the statute are listed in any kind of priority, but it just so happens that the first one that I am instructed to consider is the nature of the crime and the circumstances of the offense.

This defendant killed two young men. He wanted to kill other young men, and he wanted to kill dozens or maybe hundreds of other Americans and other nationalities who were civilians. I can't think of a more serious crime. And as the

raison d'être of al-Qaeda to do things like that, it occurred under the most aggravated circumstances that it possibly could.

1.3

And I think it says something when the very able-defense counsel, and I want to commend them for the yeoman job they did here under the most difficult circumstances, but they were forced to argue as one of their lead arguments that, well, at least it isn't a war crime.

Now implicit in that is the suggestion that maybe it's not as bad killing soldiers as it is killing civilians because it's not a war crime to kill soldiers. That's a degree of relativism that really does not have any meaning for me. And, frankly, I am confident that the defendant does not differentiate between whether his victims are American civilians who are American soldiers. We know that from his plot to bomb the embassy, which would have had many civilian casualties. Now I understand that what defense counsel is really arguing is that the defendant should be treated as a soldier rather than as a criminal, even if he's an unlawful soldier under the laws of war.

Putting aside the fact that that does not accommodate the bombing conspiracy, soldiers in war time do not target embassies located in third countries.

I reject it because Congress has rejected it. It has given the Executive Branch discretion as to whether to

1.3

PROCEEDINGS

prosecute these crimes in district court or not, and it's not for me to second guess the Executive as a mitigating factor in determining the appropriate sentence for a federal crime.

I do agree with the government that defense counsels' attempt to present this in a war context is really a backdoor way of arguing that the case shouldn't have been tried in this court. And since it was, I guess the meaning is it should be a mitigating factor.

It's kind of like when the defendant kept saying to me at the beginning of the case, and it's consistent with what he said to the marshals today, that he wanted to be tried in the World Court and he wouldn't recognize any court other than the World Court.

Now, you know, I rejected the enemy combatant defense, which is a recognized defense to certain criminal charges. There is such a defense. But none of its prerequisites were met here, and I don't think they are any more applicable or the defense is any more applicable at sentencing. I know there's an academic opinion on which the defendant's relied that says this ought to be treated under the Geneva Convention. I think Congress has given the Executive the choice of whether to do that or not.

So I'm not expressing a view on whether a case like this ought to be tried in a civilian court or a military court. That's not my issue. Congress has criminalized this

characteristic was on full display. He was quite willing to

talk to me, and I think he was quite willing to talk to his

24

25

1.3

PROCEEDINGS

lawyers as well, when he thought he had a chance of persuading us of his point of view. But when it became clear that that wasn't going to happen, then he just decided to boycott, and that continues to this morning.

And his statement to the marshal "This is not my court, that is not my judge," that is his attitude from day one in this proceeding. I don't see him caring about anything or anyone except what he wants to do. He has one here and that's to kill Americans. That's all there is to his history and characteristics, as far as I'm concerned.

Another factor the statute requires me to consider is deterrence, both general and specific.

Now I think the government's point is accurate. If this man ever walks the street again, the first thing he will do is try to kill Americans.

There's no mental health treatment I think that can solve that. That is just the way he is wired. Everything in his background and the training he sought suggests that that is a risk that we have to take very seriously.

There's not an ounce of remorse. There is not a smidgen of self-doubt about what has done with his life. I think defense counsel is right that a large part of that is one of their experts I think said narcissism, it is, but lots of criminals have mental illness without being legally incompetent. I think what we heard this morning again

1.3

PROCEEDINGS

confirms that he's making choices. And the bottom line is he needs to be deterred because the risk of death to more

Americans is very real if he is not deterred.

As to general deterrence, you know, I understand defense counsels' point that whatever sentence I pronounce here is not going to end terrorist attacks. That is clearly true.

On the other hand, I think what we have to recognize is that general deterrence in many cases, and particularly in this one, works best at the margins. You have to keep in mind that if it becomes known that the consequences I'm going to impose on this defendant today are the consequences for this conduct, well then maybe that will deter one person, maybe it will deter ten people. It won't end terror, but it might deter somebody. And even one person who gets deterred, that could mean the continuation of any number of American lives that might be at risk if that person were not deterred, and that to me is a worthwhile consideration for sentence.

Now, the defense has raised a number of mitigating factors. And I will tell you that several of those, not all of them, but several of those I think are perfectly valid and I relied on them in the right case. The fact that he was tortured in Libya. The fact that he had very difficult conditions of confinement and served a lot of time, both here and prior to coming here. And that his confinement here will

continue to be more difficult.

1.3

Now, in the right case, those are perfectly valid things for me to consider. And I think the defense has done a fine job of presenting those. But they are so grossly overshadowed and overwhelmed by the other sentencing factors that I've articulated; deterrence, seriousness of the crime, history and characteristics of this defendant that, you know, I'm considering them and I think they're valid, but they don't reduce the sentence be it below what those factors compel.

The only other thing I will also say, I'm not seeing the defenses' argument on acceptance of responsibility.

Boasting is not accepting responsibility. Acknowledging evil while being proud of doing evil is not acceptance of responsibility. So I'm not taking that into account as a serious factor I need to consider.

And then I think the last thing the defense counsel raised was that a life sentence here would not match or at least would not be in the same ballpark as sentences handed out in similar cases.

I'm convinced by the government's submission that there is no issue of sentencing disparity here because these crimes are each so sui generis that it's very hard to compare them across the board. I do not see a life sentence here as an outlier in any way. For those reasons, the sentence is as follows:

1.3

PROCEEDINGS

As to Counts One and Two, life imprisonment on each counts to run concurrently.

As to Counts Three and Four, 15 years on each counts to run concurrently with each other.

And with Counts One and Two, and as to Count Six, ten years to run consecutively to the Counts One and Two.

I will impose the mandatory I believe it's a 600-dollar special assessment.

I'm not going to impose supervised release because I don't think this defendant should ever get out.

And I'm not going to grant defense counsels' request for a sentencing recommendation to the BOP. I think the BOP is going to have its hands full with this violent and uncooperative defendant and it's got to allocate such resources in a manner it deems appropriate to effectuate sentence.

Now technically I don't think the defendant's been listening to me, but again for the sake of good order, I will tell him if he wants to appeal his conviction or the sentence, he has got to get a notice of appeal filed within 14 days. His lawyers will do for him. The clerk will do it if he is certifies he can't afford a lawyer, or he can get a form and do to himself. But if he doesn't see to it that it gets filed in 14 days, he will have waived any right to appeal that he may have.

record, and I also think you have gone way beyond what usual

professional commitment requires in handling this case and you

be relieved so that someone can have a full look at the

23

24

25